

28 August 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: Participants in the USSR and Southeast Asia Area Programs
conducted by the Office of Training, summer 1952.

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Program.

The Office of Training wishes to prepare an evaluation of the two summer area programs held during July and August. This evaluation depends primarily on your assessments. It will be used for guidance in planning future related programs. Your contribution of comment and constructive suggestions will be much appreciated (It is emphasized that collection of only favorable, or only favorable comments is not the object of this assessment. It is desired to assemble objective favorable and unfavorable comments as guidance for planning future related programs). It is suggested that your remarks include comments on the following points.

1. Do you feel that this type of area program can contribute to increasing analyst effectiveness? If so, why? If not, why not? What type of program would be more useful?

2. Do you feel that this particular program was useful to you? If so, how? If not, why not?

3. Please comment on the following:

a. Content and scope of subject matter (Particularly, did you feel that it was relevant or irrelevant to your normal work problems; that it was possibly relevant, but of a nature that it is beyond analysts in your component necessarily have before they can qualify for the work for which they were employed; that it was relevant, but too general or too specific.)

b. Manner and method of presentation.

c. Time allotted for course (Was the number of weeks inadequate, adequate or excessive? Was the period of two hours for each session too short, satisfactory, or too long?)

d. Was the balance between lecture and discussion satisfactory, or do you feel that it would have been helpful to have more discussion or less discussion? Would you favor having certain periods devoted entirely to discussion of selected problems?

CONFIDENTIAL
Security Information

- 2 -

4. Do you approve of the policy that students not be required to do collateral reading or prepare papers, or do you think it would be both reasonable and useful if students expected to do limited reading and preparation of papers?

In addition to your remarks on the above points, any other comments or suggestions that you may wish to contribute for improvement of future related programs will be appreciated.

Please forward your written comments to Room 1301, "I" 25X1 Building as early as possible.

2 September 1952

1. —
2. —

3a. The program, so far as what could reasonably be expected of it, was adequate. It must be recognized that members of the class differed widely in educational backgrounds, current fields of activity, and degrees of interest in the subject under discussion. This precluded any more than a general area study. As such it was in my opinion quite successful. It is and would probably have to remain a treatment whose chief value consists in filling in a background to the analyst's field.

b. —

c. —

d. The danger in attempting to carry on discussions with a group of people such as we had was the tendency for a small number to monopolize the discussion. A possible solution, though not necessarily a good one, would be to use a class roster and thereby give everyone an opportunity to participate.

(over)

CONFIDENTIAL

Another fault in the matter of class discussion which was frequently in evidence in our class was the practice of the professor to close a subject and then call for questions. No questions were asked and consequently no discussion developed. It follows, therefore, that no discussion period can be initiated merely by calling for questions and waiting. The professor must be prepared to suggest subjects controversial enough to stimulate discussion.

4. No outside papers should be required. Book lists for all courses should be prepared and distributed. This is preferable to the teacher reciting several books and authors and giving the class little or no time to copy down the reference. Some outside reading should be required or at least encouraged.

25X1

Miscellaneous: My chief criticism of the course was the lack of coordination among the teachers. [redacted] initially presented the history of the U.S.S.R. [redacted] who followed him, discussed the political development of the Russian government during his first lectures and then, after stressing the importance of history for an understanding of this development, presented a series of lectures in history, much of which had been covered earlier by [redacted].

25X1